

To: Wall, Dan[wall.dan@epa.gov]; McKean, Deborah[mckean.deborah@epa.gov]
Cc: Miller, Johanna[Miller.Johanna@epa.gov]; Stavnes, Sandra[Stavnes.Sandra@epa.gov]; Hestmark, Martin[Hestmark.Martin@epa.gov]; Jenkins, Laura Flynn[Jenkins.Laura@epa.gov]
From: Card, Joan
Sent: Thur 4/14/2016 1:53:23 PM
Subject: RE: OW, RANDY, R8 ACTION - Daily Caller (DDL COB today): GKM water quality

Thanks all.

From: Wall, Dan
Sent: Thursday, April 14, 2016 7:43 AM
To: McKean, Deborah <mckean.deborah@epa.gov>
Cc: Miller, Johanna <Miller.Johanna@epa.gov>; Card, Joan <Card.Joan@epa.gov>; Stavnes, Sandra <Stavnes.Sandra@epa.gov>; Hestmark, Martin <Hestmark.Martin@epa.gov>; Jenkins, Laura Flynn <Jenkins.Laura@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: OW, RANDY, R8 ACTION - Daily Caller (DDL COB today): GKM water quality

I concur with the language. Neither the supplemental response nor the original response however, answer the original question of whether EPA has a plan in place to protect receptors In the event risks are incurred due to runoff. If I was the reporter, I would interpret both responses

Deliberative Process/Ex. 5

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 14, 2016, at 7:33 AM, McKean, Deborah <mckean.deborah@epa.gov> wrote:

For clarity I would just add a bit to this:

Deliberative Process/Ex. 5

From: Miller, Johanna
Sent: Thursday, April 14, 2016 7:25 AM
To: Card, Joan <Card.Joan@epa.gov>
Cc: McKean, Deborah <mckean.deborah@epa.gov>; Stavnes, Sandra <Stavnes.Sandra@epa.gov>; Hestmark, Martin <Hestmark.Martin@epa.gov>; Jenkins, Laura Flynn <Jenkins.Laura@epa.gov>; Wall, Dan <wall.dan@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: OW, RANDY, R8 ACTION - Daily Caller (DDL COB today): GKM water quality

+ Dan Wall

Deliberative Process/Ex. 5

Deliberative Process/Ex. 5

Then proceed with the info on the notification protocols being developed.

Johanna
Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 13, 2016, at 6:07 PM, Card, Joan <Card.Joan@epa.gov> wrote:

+ Johanna in case she can review for accuracy.

Joan Card

Senior Policy Advisor

Region 8

Sent from my EPA iPhone

On Apr 13, 2016, at 5:55 PM, Card, Joan <Card.Joan@epa.gov> wrote:

Deb, is the statement below accurate for a response to a reporter? Thank you.

Joan Card

Senior Policy Advisor

Region 8

Sent from my EPA iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "StClair, Christie" <StClair.Christie@epa.gov>
Date: April 13, 2016 at 5:51:33 PM MDT
To: "Card, Joan" <Card.Joan@epa.gov>
Cc: "Wall, Tom" <Wall.Tom@epa.gov>, "Deitz, Randy" <Deitz.Randy@epa.gov>, "Jenkins, Laura Flynn" <Jenkins.Laura@epa.gov>, "Grantham, Nancy" <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>, "Loop, Travis" <Loop.Travis@epa.gov>, "Schollhamer, Mary" <Schollhamer.Mary@epa.gov>, "Belle, Kara" <Belle.Kara@epa.gov>, "Wells, Suzanne" <Wells.Suzanne@epa.gov>, "Mattas-Curry, Lahne" <Mattas-Curry.Lahne@epa.gov>, "Evans, David" <Evans.David@epa.gov>, "Bravo, Antonio" <Bravo.Antonio@epa.gov>, "Holdsworth, Susan" <Holdsworth.Susan@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: OW, RANDY, R8 ACTION - Daily Caller (DDL COB today): GKM water quality

No we need r8 concurrence asap please

Christie St. Clair

U.S. EPA Office of Media Relations

c: 202-768-5780

On Apr 13, 2016, at 7:50 PM, Card, Joan <Card.Joan@epa.gov> wrote:

Christie or Laura, our folks have vetted that statement, correct?

Joan Card

Senior Policy Advisor

Region 8

Sent from my EPA iPhone

On Apr 13, 2016, at 3:50 PM, Wall, Tom <Wall.Tom@epa.gov> wrote:

Will defer to Region 8 and ORD re: this statement though, based on my limited experience it seems reasonable:

Deliberative Process/Ex. 5

From: Deitz, Randy
Sent: Wednesday, April 13, 2016 5:47 PM
To: StClair, Christie <StClair.Christie@epa.gov>; Jenkins, Laura Flynn <Jenkins.Laura@epa.gov>; Card, Joan <Card.Joan@epa.gov>; Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>; Wall, Tom <Wall.Tom@epa.gov>; Loop, Travis <Loop.Travis@epa.gov>; Schollhamer, Mary <Schollhamer.Mary@epa.gov>; Belle, Kara <Belle.Kara@epa.gov>; Wells, Suzanne <Wells.Suzanne@epa.gov>; Mattas-Curry, Lahne <Mattas-Curry.Lahne@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: OW, RANDY, R8 ACTION - Daily Caller (DDL COB today): GKM water quality

I think that is an accurate statement, but I will defer to my colleagues more familiar with ongoing sampling. I would remove the word "any".

Deliberative Process/Ex. 5

Deliberative Process/Ex. 5

Randy Deitz

Attorney Advisor

Office of Land and Emergency Management

(202) 566-0197

From: StClair, Christie

Sent: Wednesday, April 13, 2016 5:33 PM

To: Jenkins, Laura Flynn <Jenkins.Laura@epa.gov>; Card, Joan <Card.Joan@epa.gov>; Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>; Wall, Tom <Wall.Tom@epa.gov>; Deitz, Randy <Deitz.Randy@epa.gov>; Loop, Travis <Loop.Travis@epa.gov>; Schollhamer, Mary <Schollhamer.Mary@epa.gov>; Belle, Kara <Belle.Kara@epa.gov>; Wells, Suzanne <Wells.Suzanne@epa.gov>; Mattas-Curry, Lahne <Mattas-Curry.Lahne@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: OW, RANDY, R8 ACTION - Daily Caller (DDL COB today): GKM water quality

Since the MSI study isn't public and the ORD study isn't final yet, and this is due today for a story running tonight, I'd like to keep this simple.

Could we do something along these lines:

Deliberative Process/Ex. 5

Christie St. Clair

Office of Public Affairs

Environmental Protection Agency

Washington, DC

o: 202-564-2880

m: 202-768-5780

From: Jenkins, Laura Flynn

Sent: Wednesday, April 13, 2016 4:45 PM

To: StClair, Christie <StClair.Christie@epa.gov>; Card, Joan <Card.Joan@epa.gov>; Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>; Wall, Tom <Wall.Tom@epa.gov>; Deitz, Randy <Deitz.Randy@epa.gov>; Loop, Travis <Loop.Travis@epa.gov>; Schollhamer, Mary <Schollhamer.Mary@epa.gov>; Belle, Kara <Belle.Kara@epa.gov>; Wells, Suzanne <Wells.Suzanne@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: OW, RANDY, R8 ACTION - Daily Caller (DDL COB today): GKM water quality

I'll defer to those with more expertise than me for specifics but it seems like we could use one or more these approaches:

Deliberative Process/Ex. 5

Deliberative Process/Ex. 5

Not super helpful but this is clearly a loaded question and I think correcting his erroneous assumptions straight-on is always a wise choice with this reporter.

Laura Jenkins

Media Officer

USEPA-Region 8

1595 Wynkoop St.

Mailcode: 8-OC

Denver, CO 80202

Landline: 303-312-6256

Cell: 202-360-8453

Fax: 303-312-6961

From: StClair, Christie

Sent: Wednesday, April 13, 2016 1:52 PM

To: Card, Joan <Card.Joan@epa.gov>

Cc: Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>; Wall, Tom <Wall.Tom@epa.gov>; Jenkins, Laura Flynn

<Jenkins.Laura@epa.gov>; Deitz, Randy

<Deitz.Randy@epa.gov>; Loop, Travis <Loop.Travis@epa.gov>;

Schollhamer, Mary <Schollhamer.Mary@epa.gov>; Belle, Kara
<Belle.Kara@epa.gov>; Wells, Suzanne
<Wells.Suzanne@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: OW, RANDY, R8 ACTION - Daily Caller (DDL
COB today): GKM water quality

All, please send me your thoughts on how best to respond to this follow-up from the reporter:

To be clear on my second question: the EPA does not have a plan to immediately protect human health and wildlife if measurements during storm events show contaminants reached dangerous levels. Is that correct?

Thanks,
Christie

Christie St. Clair

Office of Public Affairs

Environmental Protection Agency

Washington, DC

o: 202-564-2880

m: 202-768-5780

From: StClair, Christie

Sent: Wednesday, April 13, 2016 2:54 PM

To: Card, Joan <Card.Joan@epa.gov>

Cc: Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>; Wall, Tom
<Wall.Tom@epa.gov>; Jenkins, Laura Flynn

<Jenkins.Laura@epa.gov>; Deitz, Randy
<Deitz.Randy@epa.gov>; Loop, Travis <Loop.Travis@epa.gov>;
Schollhamer, Mary <Schollhamer.Mary@epa.gov>; Belle, Kara
<Belle.Kara@epa.gov>; Wells, Suzanne
<Wells.Suzanne@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: OW, RANDY, R8 ACTION - Daily Caller (DDL
COB today): GKM water quality

Thanks, everybody, for your help. Below is the final I'll send.

1. I understand that part of the monitoring plan at the Animas River involves monitoring contaminant levels during storms events. Does this monitoring also include the San Juan River?

Yes. All monitoring sites are listed in the final plan, which is on the Gold King Mine response site. Here is the document's url:
https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-03/documents/post-gkm-final-conceptual-monitoring-plan_2016_03_24_16.pdf

You'll find the sites listed on pages 13-15.

2. Does the EPA have a plan to protect human and wildlife health if that monitoring shows spiked contaminant levels during storm events?

Historically, the Animas River has an elevated "normal" (pre-event) level of metals independent of the Gold King Mine release, due to the constant supply of acid mine drainage into the river from many sources.

Acid mine drainage has been released into the rivers for many decades and winter runoff and major storms may kick up material that had settled to the bottom of the rivers. So those using the river for recreation, agriculture or drinking water should use the same precautions they always have.

Deliberative Process/Ex. 5

Here is some additional background on the region you may find useful.

EPA and the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) conducted a Superfund Site Assessment of the area in the 1990s. The assessment showed that water quality standards were not achieved in the Animas River near Silverton and identified the severe impacts to aquatic life in the Upper Animas and its tributaries from naturally occurring and mining-related heavy metals. In recognition of the community-based collaborative effort, EPA agreed to postpone adding all or a portion of the site to the Superfund NPL, as long as progress was being made to improve the water quality of the Animas River. Until approximately 2005, water quality in the Animas River was improving. However, since 2005, water quality in the Animas River has not improved and, for at least 20 miles below the confluence with Cement Creek and the water quality has declined significantly. Impacts to aquatic life were also demonstrated by fish population surveys conducted by Colorado Parks and Wildlife, which found no fish in the Animas River below Cement Creek for approximately two miles and observed precipitous declines in fish populations as far as 20 miles downstream since 2005. Because of this declining water quality in the Animas River, in 2008, EPA's Superfund Site Assessment program began investigations in Upper Cement Creek focused on evaluating whether the Upper Cement Creek area alone would qualify for inclusion on the NPL. This evaluation indicated that the area would qualify, although after receiving additional community input, EPA postponed efforts to include the area on the National Priorities List. Since that time, EPA has continued and broadened its investigations of conditions at the site in order to understand the major sources of heavy metal contamination in the Upper Animas. **SITE RISK:** Mining operations have greatly disturbed the land, adding to existing highly mineralized conditions in many areas of the site. Mineralized waste rock exposed to air and water causes acidic conditions to mobilize the release of heavy metals to the surrounding environment. These heavy metals have found their way into the Animas River and its tributaries and have eventually traveled farther downstream.

3. How long will it take to complete cleaning at the Bonita Pike Mining District and how much will it cost? Additionally, what are the time and cost estimates to finish cleaning just Gold King Mine and the Animas River?

Deliberative Process/Ex. 5

Christie St. Clair

Office of Public Affairs

Environmental Protection Agency

Washington, DC

o: 202-564-2880

m: 202-768-5780

From: Card, Joan

Sent: Wednesday, April 13, 2016 2:50 PM

To: StClair, Christie <StClair.Christie@epa.gov>

Cc: Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>; Wall, Tom <Wall.Tom@epa.gov>; Jenkins, Laura Flynn <Jenkins.Laura@epa.gov>; Deitz, Randy <Deitz.Randy@epa.gov>; Loop, Travis <Loop.Travis@epa.gov>; Schollhamer, Mary <Schollhamer.Mary@epa.gov>; Belle, Kara <Belle.Kara@epa.gov>; Wells, Suzanne <Wells.Suzanne@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: OW, RANDY, R8 ACTION - Daily Caller (DDL COB today): GKM water quality

Having heard no other input from LT, ok.

Joan Card

Senior Policy Advisor

Region 8

Sent from my EPA iPhone

On Apr 13, 2016, at 1:45 PM, StClair, Christie <StClair.Christie@epa.gov> wrote:

Joan, does R8 concur with the version below?

Christie St. Clair

Office of Public Affairs

Environmental Protection Agency

Washington, DC

o: 202-564-2880

m: 202-768-5780

From: Card, Joan

Sent: Wednesday, April 13, 2016 2:33 PM

To: Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>
Cc: Wall, Tom <Wall.Tom@epa.gov>; StClair, Christie <StClair.Christie@epa.gov>; Jenkins, Laura Flynn <Jenkins.Laura@epa.gov>; Deitz, Randy <Deitz.Randy@epa.gov>; Loop, Travis <Loop.Travis@epa.gov>; Schollhamer, Mary <Schollhamer.Mary@epa.gov>; Belle, Kara <Belle.Kara@epa.gov>; Wells, Suzanne <Wells.Suzanne@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: OW, RANDY, R8 ACTION - Daily Caller (DDL COB today): GKM water quality

Now I see that deletion. Thanks.

Joan Card

Senior Policy Advisor

Region 8

Sent from my EPA iPhone

On Apr 13, 2016, at 1:31 PM, Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov> wrote:

I agree – it leans too far in .. in my view.

Thanks ng

From: Wall, Tom
Sent: Wednesday, April 13, 2016 2:31 PM
To: StClair, Christie <StClair.Christie@epa.gov>; Jenkins, Laura Flynn <Jenkins.Laura@epa.gov>; Card, Joan <Card.Joan@epa.gov>; Deitz, Randy <Deitz.Randy@epa.gov>
Cc: Loop, Travis <Loop.Travis@epa.gov>; Schollhamer, Mary <Schollhamer.Mary@epa.gov>; Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>; Belle, Kara <Belle.Kara@epa.gov>; Wells, Suzanne <Wells.Suzanne@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: OW, RANDY, R8 ACTION - Daily Caller (DDL COB today): GKM water quality

Deliberative Process/Ex. 5

Deliberative Process/Ex. 5

Tom W.

From: StClair, Christie
Sent: Wednesday, April 13, 2016 2:18 PM
To: Jenkins, Laura Flynn <Jenkins.Laura@epa.gov>; Wall, Tom <Wall.Tom@epa.gov>; Card, Joan <Card.Joan@epa.gov>; Deitz, Randy <Deitz.Randy@epa.gov>
Cc: Loop, Travis <Loop.Travis@epa.gov>; Schollhamer, Mary <Schollhamer.Mary@epa.gov>; Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>; Belle, Kara <Belle.Kara@epa.gov>; Wells, Suzanne <Wells.Suzanne@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: OW, RANDY, R8 ACTION - Daily Caller (DDL COB today): GKM water quality

Some tweaks below. GTG from R8? OW?

Christie St. Clair

Office of Public Affairs

Environmental Protection Agency

Washington, DC

o: 202-564-2880

m: 202-768-5780

From: Jenkins, Laura Flynn
Sent: Wednesday, April 13, 2016 1:41 PM
To: StClair, Christie <StClair.Christie@epa.gov>; Wall, Tom

<Wall.Tom@epa.gov>; Card, Joan <Card.Joan@epa.gov>;
Deitz, Randy <Deitz.Randy@epa.gov>
Cc: Loop, Travis <Loop.Travis@epa.gov>; Schollhamer, Mary
<Schollhamer.Mary@epa.gov>; Grantham, Nancy
<Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>; Belle, Kara
<Belle.Kara@epa.gov>; Wells, Suzanne
<Wells.Suzanne@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: OW, RANDY, R8 ACTION - Daily Caller (DDL
COB today): GKM water quality

Christie:

Deliberative Process/Ex. 5

Thanks for the chance to review.

Laura Jenkins

Media Officer

USEPA-Region 8

1595 Wynkoop St.

Mailcode: 8-OC

Denver, CO 80202

Landline: 303-312-6256

Cell: 202-360-8453

Fax: 303-312-6961

From: StClair, Christie
Sent: Wednesday, April 13, 2016 11:00 AM
To: Wall, Tom <Wall.Tom@epa.gov>; Card, Joan <Card.Joan@epa.gov>; Jenkins, Laura Flynn <Jenkins.Laura@epa.gov>; Deitz, Randy <Deitz.Randy@epa.gov>
Cc: Loop, Travis <Loop.Travis@epa.gov>; Schollhamer, Mary <Schollhamer.Mary@epa.gov>; Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>; Belle, Kara <Belle.Kara@epa.gov>; Wells, Suzanne <Wells.Suzanne@epa.gov>
Subject: OW, RANDY, R8 ACTION - Daily Caller (DDL COB today): GKM water quality

Ethan Barton is looking for our response on this by end of today. We've addressed most of this previously, so I'm just looking for OW, OLEM IO, and R8 approval before sending.

1. I understand that part of the monitoring plan at the Animas River involves monitoring contaminant levels during storms events. Does this monitoring also include the San Juan River?

Deliberative Process/Ex. 5

2. Does the EPA have a plan to protect human and wildlife health if that monitoring shows spiked contaminant levels during storm events?

Deliberative Process/Ex. 5

Deliberative Process/Ex. 5

Deliberative Process/Ex. 5

Here is some additional background on the region you may find useful.

EPA and the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) conducted a Superfund Site Assessment of the area in the 1990s. The assessment showed that water quality standards were not achieved in the Animas River near Silverton and identified the severe impacts to aquatic life in the Upper Animas and its tributaries from naturally occurring and mining-related heavy metals. In recognition of the community-based collaborative effort, EPA agreed to postpone adding all or a portion of the site to the Superfund NPL, as long as progress was being made to improve the water quality of the Animas River. Until approximately 2005, water quality in the Animas River was improving. However, since 2005, water quality in the Animas River has not improved and, for at least 20 miles below the confluence with Cement Creek and the water quality has declined significantly. Impacts to aquatic life were also demonstrated by fish population surveys conducted by Colorado Parks and Wildlife, which found no fish in the Animas River below Cement Creek for approximately two miles and observed precipitous declines in fish populations as far as 20 miles downstream since 2005. Because of this declining water quality in the Animas River, in 2008, EPA's Superfund Site Assessment program began investigations in Upper Cement Creek focused on evaluating whether the Upper Cement Creek area alone would qualify for inclusion on the NPL. This evaluation indicated that the area would qualify, although after receiving additional community input, EPA postponed efforts to include the area on the National Priorities List. Since that time, EPA has continued and broadened its investigations of conditions at the site in order to understand the major sources of heavy metal contamination in the Upper Animas. **SITE RISK:** Mining operations have greatly disturbed the land, adding to existing highly mineralized conditions in many areas of the site. Mineralized waste rock exposed to air and water causes acidic conditions to mobilize the release of heavy metals to the surrounding environment. These heavy metals have found their way into the Animas River and its tributaries and have eventually traveled farther downstream.

3. How long will it take to complete cleaning at the Bonita Pike Mining District and how much will it cost? Additionally, what are the time and cost estimates to finish cleaning just Gold King Mine and the Animas River?

[OLEM review – ok to use language from previous responses?.] Prior to completing an RI/FS, EPA will not know

what the site's cleanup scope will be, and, therefore, we can't estimate how long cleanup actions will take. At all sites, the length of time to complete all remediation work depends on a number of site specific factors. For example, it's hard to predict what year the remedial investigation and feasibility study will be done, how many other sites will be in the queue for funding that year, and whether there will be one or more PRPs helping pay for the cleanup. We also don't know yet what the exact problems are, and what the remedies should be --- that information, which will be included in the remediation proposal, will ultimately determine project cost and timeline.

Christie St. Clair

Office of Public Affairs

Environmental Protection Agency

Washington, DC

o: 202-564-2880

m: 202-768-5780